

*Application No. 10/673779*  
*Page 6*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. 011.2B-11335-US01*

**Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **February 23, 2006**. A **two month Extension of Time** is requested.

**COMMENTS**

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

**Claims 1-5 and 7-10**

The examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied in paragraph 3 of the previous office action. Paragraph 3 of the previous office action rejects applicant's claims *over* Inoue et al. US 2001/0003672 ("Inoue") further in view of Tanaka et al. JP 2001-118815 ("Tanaka").

In contrast to this examiner's rejection, we believe that claims 1-5 and 7-10 are patentable over Inoue further in view of Tanaka.

Like the claimed invention, the invention of Inoue is directed to a polishing composition that is used for polishing wafer surfaces. Contrastingly, the invention of Tanaka is directed to a polishing composition that is used for polishing wafer edges. As shown in paragraph [0007] of Tanaka, the polishing of wafer edges is significantly different from the polishing of wafer surfaces in polishing conditions including the polishing pressure and the linear velocity of the polishing pad. The polishing composition of Tanaka is a polishing composition that is modified to be expressly suitable for such polishing of wafer edges. Therefore, there would be no motivation for a person skilled in the art to modify the polishing composition of Inoue further in view of Tanaka as suggested by the examiner. Further, neither Inoue nor Tanaka disclose or suggest that an average primary particle diameter and average secondary particle diameter of colloidal silica influence the level of haze that occurs on a wafer surface.

*Application No. 10/673779*  
*Page 7*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. 011.2B-11335-US01*

In light of the foregoing, we believe that claims 1-5 and 7-10 are patentable over Inoue further in view of Tanaka.

Claims 12-17

The examiner has rejected claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied in paragraph 4 of the previous office action. Paragraph 4 of the previous office action rejects applicant's claims over Inoue further in view of Kato et al. US 5,904,159 ("Kato").

In view of this examiner's rejection, claims 12-17 have been canceled.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: July 7, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Scott Q. Vidas

Registration No.: 30812

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000  
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185  
Telephone: (952) 563-3000  
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpworksq\11335us01\_and\_20060707.doc